UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/912,352	07/26/2001	Lawrence A. Denenberg	782.1100	5411
21171 STAAS & HAI	7590 06/09/200 SEY LLP	EXAMINER		
SUITE 700			GAUTHIER, GERALD	
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,		2614	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/09/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/912,352	DENENBERG ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Gerald Gauthier	2614				
The MAILING DATE of this communi Period for Reply	cation appears on the cover sheet w	th the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOTHE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNION. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this common. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum states are period for reply within the set or extended period for reply any reply received by the Office later than three months at earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	CATION. of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a runication. of days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirt tutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON will, by statute, cause the application to become AE	reply be timely filed by (30) days will be considered timely. ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) file	d on <u>07 <i>April 2008</i></u> .					
2a) This action is FINAL . 2	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition t	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practic	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-29,31-41 and 44-64</u> is/are	Claim(s) <u>1-29,31-41 and 44-64</u> is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/ar	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) is/are rejected.	Claim(s) is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)☐ Claim(s) <u>1-29,31-41 and 44-64</u> are s	Claim(s) <u>1-29,31-41 and 44-64</u> are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are:) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any object	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to	by the Examiner. Note the attached	d Office Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
2. Certified copies of the priority of3. Copies of the certified copies of	documents have been received. documents have been received in A of the priority documents have been nal Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)	A) 🗖 1	Summary (DTO 442)				
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P	TO-948) Paper No(s	Gummary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or I Paper No(s)/Mail Date		nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 2614

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claims 1-35, 44-48 and 52-63, drawn to categorizing each of the plurality of messages into at least two overlapping list, classified in class 709, subclass 206.
- II. Claims 36-41and 49-51, drawn to presenting the newly-arrived message to a user of the newly-arrived message, classified in class 379, subclass 88.17.
- III. Claim 64, drawn to an addressee of the messaging controlling a sort order of the messages, classified in class 379, subclass 69.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions I, II and III are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because the messaging system is working in different aspect of the invention. The subcombination has separate utility such as categorizing the plurality of messages, presenting newly-arrived message to the user and having the addressee sorting the messages.

Art Unit: 2614

The examiner has required restriction between combination and subcombination inventions. Where applicant elects a subcombination, and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

- 3. Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:
 - (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;
 - (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;
 - (c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);
 - (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;

(e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C.101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Application/Control Number: 09/912,352

Art Unit: 2614

4. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Page 5

5. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims.

Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result

Art Unit: 2614

in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gerald Gauthier whose telephone number is (571) 272-7539. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on (571) 272-7547. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2614

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Gerald Gauthier/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2614

GG June 9, 2008